

manufacturing method integrally forming into a one-piece structure through an insert molding or double molding process, materials having different dielectric constants and forming the radome or radar cover.

## REMARKS

### I. Double Patenting Rejection

According to claims 1-2, 4-5, 9, 11-12, and 18-19 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of double patenting over claims 2, 4, 7, 14, and 18 of Application No. 10/390,596, now issued as U.S. Patent 6,937,184.

In response, a terminal disclaimer is filed concurrently herewith to obviate this rejection. Also, submitted concurrently herewith is a copy of an assignment document indicating an assignment of this patent application from Hitachi Car Engineering Co., Ltd. to Hitachi, Ltd.

### II. Specification

According to the Office Action, the disclosure is objected to because of the informality on page 4 of the specification, line 26, in that the abbreviation "ABS" is alleged to be unclear. It is requested that the abbreviation be spelled out completely at least once in the specification.

In response, the specification, and specifically the paragraph beginning on page 4, line 12, has been amended to spell out the abbreviation of "ABS", which is acrylonitrile butadiene styrene.

### III. Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

According to the Office Action, claims 8 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. In particular, it is allegedly not clear as to what is meant by the "ABS" in the claims.

In response, claims 8 and 17 are amended to specify acrylonitrile butadiene styrene for ABS.

#### IV. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

According to the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6, 9, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for allegedly being anticipated by Japanese reference JP2001127523 (Kenichi). Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for allegedly being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the Kenichi reference. Claims 7-8 and 13-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the Kenichi reference in view of U.S. Patent 6,496,138 (Honma). Claims 10-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for allegedly being obvious over the Kenichi reference in view of U.S. Patent 5,275,880 (Boyer). Claims 18-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the Kenichi reference in view of U.S. Patent 6,111,551 (Schmidt).

In response, claims 18-19 are cancelled; claim 12 is amended to depend on claim 1; and claim 1 is amended to recite "wherein the radome or the radar cover is provided with a radio wave absorbing layer formed through an insert molding process or a double molding process." As discussed in the specification on page

16, lines 7-17, by employing an insert molding process or double molding process, it becomes possible to avoid a radio-wave absorbing layer being exposed to humidity and temperature variations. In this regard, it is preferable that the radio-wave absorbing layer is not exposed to the outside environment as much as possible since the characteristics of the layer tends to be affected by changing circumstances.

The Kenichi reference, with particular reference to paragraph [0031], fails to suggest or teach a molding process or double molding process for the radio-wave absorbing layer. With regard to the Schmidt reference, any arrangement using a radio-wave absorbing layer is not disclosed at all; therefore, it is not possible to absorb a reflected radio-wave within the radome. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-14.

#### V. Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 15-16 are allowed. Claim 17 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicants sincerely appreciate with the Examiner's findings that these claims represent allowed and allowable subject matter. Claim 17 has been amended herein to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, and therefore, should be in condition for allowance. In addition, claims 16 and 17 are rewritten in independent format.

#### VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, and the submission of the terminal disclaimer, allowance of this patent application is respectfully requested.

If there are any questions regarding this Amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response. Please charge any such fee or any deficiency in fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket 056203.53286US).

Respectfully submitted,

CROWELL & MORING LLP

Dated: November 22, 2005

By George L. Fountain  
George L. Fountain  
Reg. No. 36,374  
Tel.: (949) 263-8400 (Pacific Coast)

Intellectual Property Group  
P.O. Box 14300  
Washington, D.C. 20044-4300

---

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8A)**

*I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:*

**MAILING**

☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

**FACSIMILE**

☐ transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and Trademark Office.

Lori Lapidario  
Lori Lapidario

November 22, 2005

Date